arXiv:1304.6135v1 [math.CA] 22 Apr 2013

UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE ON WEIGHTED SPHERES, BALLS AND SIMPLEXES

YUAN XU

Abstract. For a family of weight functions h_κ that are invariant under a reflection group, the uncertainty principle on the unit sphere in the form of

$$\min_{1\le i\le d}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(1-x_i)|f(x)|^2h_\kappa^2(x)d\sigma\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}|\nabla_0 f(x)|^2\,h_k^2(x)d\sigma\ge c$$

is established for invariant functions f that have unit norm and zero mean, where ∇_0 is the spherical gradient. In the same spirit, uncertainty principles for weighted spaces on the unit ball and on the standard simplex are established, some of them hold for all admissible functions instead of invariant functions.

1. Introduction

In the form of the classical Heisenberg inequality, the uncertainty principle in $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be stated as

$$\inf_{a\in\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|x-a\|^2|f(x)|^2dx\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\nabla f(x)|^2dx\ge\frac{d^2}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f(x)|^2dx\right)^2,$$

where ∇ is the gradient operator. The uncertainty principle has been studied extensively in various settings, see [6, 10] and the references therein. Recently, in [2], we established an uncertainty principle on the unit sphere. Let $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ denote the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let ∇_0 denote the spherical gradient on $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. The uncertainty inequality in [2] takes the form

$$\min_{e\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(1-\langle x,e\rangle)|f(x)|^2d\sigma\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}|\nabla_0 f(x)|^2\,d\sigma\ge c_d\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}|f(x)|^2\,d\sigma\right)^2 \tag{1.1}$$

for $f\in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}f(x)=0$, where $d\sigma$ is the surface measure and c_d is a constant depending on the dimension d only. Let $\mathtt{d}(x,y)=\arccos\langle x,y\rangle$ denote the geodesic distance on the sphere. Then $1-\langle x,y\rangle=2\sin^2\frac{\mathtt{d}(x,y)}{2}\sim[\mathtt{d}(x,y)]^2$, which shows that the (1.1) is a close analogue of the classical Heisenberg uncertainty principle. Furthermore, the inequality (1.1) is shown to be stronger than an uncertainty inequality previously known [5, 7, 8, 9] in the literature.

The purpose of the present paper is to establish analogues of (1.1) in several different settings. First of all, we consider the weighed space $L^2(h_\kappa^2,\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ for a

---

Date: April 24, 2013.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B10, 42C10.

Key words and phrases. uncertainty principle, unit sphere, reflection invariant weight, ball, simplex.

The work was supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-1106113.

family of weight functions h_κ of the form

$$h_\kappa(x) = \prod_{v \in R_+} |\langle x, v\rangle|^{\kappa_v}, \qquad \kappa_v \ge 0,$$

that are invariant under a reflection group, where R_+ denotes the set of positive roots that defines the reflection group and κ_v is a a nonnegative multiplicity function defined on R_+ whose values are equal whenever reflections in positive roots are conjugate. In the case of the group $\mathbb{Z}_2^d$, the simplest case,

$$h_\kappa(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} |x_i|^{\kappa_i}, \qquad \kappa_i \ge 0.$$

In the setting of a general reflection group, the role of rotation group, under which $d\sigma$ is invariant, is replaced by $h_\kappa^2 d\sigma$ and the partial derivatives are replaced by the Dunkl operators, $\mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_d$, which are first order differential-difference operators that commute with each other [3]. In particular, the gradient is replaced by $\nabla_h := (\mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_d)$ and the operator ∇_0 is replaced by the spherical part of $\nabla_{h,0}$, which coincide with ∇_0 on functions invariant under the reflection group. Secondly, there is a close relation between analysis on the sphere and analysis on the ball, which allows us to consider the setting of $L^2(W, \mathbb{B}^d)$ for a family of weight functions W on the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^d$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$, including the weight function

$$W_{\kappa,\mu}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} |x_i|^{2\kappa_i} (1 - \|x\|^2)^{\mu - 1/2}, \quad \kappa_i \ge 0,\, \mu \ge 0,$$

and, in particular, the classical weight function $W_\mu(x) = (1 - \|x\|^2)^{\mu-1/2}$ on the ball. Thirdly, a further relation between analysis on $\mathbb{B}^d$ and that on the simplex $\mathbb{T}^d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i \ge 0, 1 - x_1 - \cdots - x_d \ge 0\}$ allows us to study uncertainty principles on the simplex $\mathbb{T}^d$ with respect to several families of weight functions, including the classical weight functions

$$U_\kappa(x) = x_1^{\kappa_1} \cdots x_d^{\kappa_d} (1 - x_1 - \ldots - x_d)^{\kappa_{d+1}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Our proof relies on various properties of differential and differential-difference operators on the sphere. The background and the basic results are reviewed in Section 2. Based on the Dunkl operators and the analogous Laplacian defined by $\Delta_h = \mathcal{D}_1^2 + \ldots + \mathcal{D}_d^2$, a rich analogue of classical harmonic analysis for the measure $h_\kappa^2 d\sigma$ has been developed (see [1, 4] and the references therein). It turns out, however, that the analogue of the spherical gradient, $\nabla_{h,0}$, has not been studied much in the literature. A detailed study of this operator and several other related operators is carried out in Section 3; the results in this section will likely be useful for further study in weighted spaces on the sphere. In Section 4, we establish our uncertainty inequalities in the space $L^2(h_\kappa^2, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. Our inequality holds for invariant functions under a general reflection group and for all functions for $\mathbb{Z}_2^d$ under a mild restriction on the parameters of the weight function. In Section 5, we deduce uncertainty inequalities on the unit ball from those on the sphere; for the classical weight function W_μ on the ball, our inequality holds for all admissible functions, not just for invariant functions. Finally, in Section 6, we deduce uncertainty inequalities on the simplex from those on the ball; the inequality for the classical weight function U_κ holds for all admissible functions.

The author thanks Feng Dai at University of Alberta for stimulating discussions on this and other related topics.

2. Preliminary

Throughout this paper, we denote by $\langle x, y\rangle$ and $\|x\|$ the usual Euclidean inner product and norm. For the formal inner product between a vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and an d-tuple of operators, say $T = (T_1, \ldots, T_d)$, we use the notation of dot product $x \cdot T$. For example, $x \cdot \nabla = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \partial_i$. We also use the dot product for the former inner product between two d-tuple of operators.

2.1. **Ordinary differential operators.** Let ∂_j denote the j-th partial derivative operator. The usual gradient operator and the Laplace operator are defined by, respectively,

$$\nabla = (\partial_1, \ldots, \partial_d) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta = \partial_1^2 + \ldots \partial_d^2.$$

We can also write, symbolically, that $\Delta = \nabla \cdot \nabla$ using the formal dot product. In spherical polar coordinates, $x = r\xi$ with $r > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have

$$\nabla = \xi \frac{d}{dr} + \frac{1}{r}\nabla_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta = \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{d-1}{r}\frac{d}{dr} + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_0, \tag{2.1}$$

where ∇_0 is the spherical gradient vector and Δ_0 is the Laplace-Beltrami operator. It is well known that Δ_0 has spherical harmonics as eigenfunctions. Furthermore, these two operators acted on ξ variables and it is easy to see that

$$\xi \cdot \nabla_0 = 0, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}.$$

Let us also mention that

$$\Delta_0 = \nabla_0 \cdot \nabla_0$$

holds. There is another family of differential operators that interact with ∇_0 and Δ_0. They are angular derivatives defined by

$$D_{i,j} = x_i \partial_j - x_j \partial_i, \qquad 1 \le i \ne j \le d.$$

In terms of polar coordinates $(x_i, x_j) = r_{i,j}(\cos\theta_{i,j}, \sin\theta_{i,j})$ on the (x_i, x_j) plane, the operator $D_{i,j}$ is the angular derivative $D_{i,j} = \partial/\partial\theta_{i,j}$. These operators are infinitesimal operators of the regular representation of the rotation group and they are closely related to the spherical gradient ∇_0 and Laplace-Beltrami opeator Δ_0. Indeed, we have

$$\Delta_0 = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} D_{i,j}^2, \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\nabla_0 f(x) \cdot \nabla_0 g(x) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} D_{i,j} f(x) D_{i,j} g(x). \tag{2.3}$$

Furthermore, it is known that, for $f, g \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} D_{i,j} f(x) g(x) d\sigma(x) = -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) D_{i,j} g(x) d\sigma(x). \tag{2.4}$$

Most of the properties in this subsection are classical. The proof of the last three displayed identities can be found in [1, Section 1.8].

2.2. **Differential-difference operators.**

Let v be a nonzero vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The reflection σ_v along v is defined by

$$x\sigma_v := x - 2\langle x, v\rangle v/\|v\|^2, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let G be a finite reflection group on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with a fixed positive root system R_+. Then G is a subgroup of the orthogonal group generated by the reflections $\{\sigma_v : v \in R_+\}$. Let κ be a nonnegative multiplicity function $v \mapsto \kappa_v$ defined on R_+ with the property that $\kappa_u = \kappa_v$ whenever σ_u is conjugate to σ_v in G; then $v \mapsto \kappa_v$ is a G-invariant function. Associated with each σ_v, we define an operator, also denoted by σ_v, by

$$\sigma_v f(x) := f(x\sigma_v).$$

We are now in a position to define the Dunkl operators introduced in [3].

Definition 2.1. *Let $v \mapsto \kappa_v$ be a multiplicity function associated with a finite reflection group G. The Dunkl operators are defined by, for $1 \le j \le d$,*

$$\mathcal{D}_j := \partial_j + \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v v_j E_v, \qquad E_v := \frac{I-\sigma_v}{\langle x, v\rangle}.$$

where $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_d)$ and I denotes the identity operator.

These are first order differential-diffenece operators and they satisfy a remarkable commuting property,

$$\mathcal{D}_i\mathcal{D}_j = \mathcal{D}_j\mathcal{D}_i, \qquad 1 \le i, j \le d.$$

Thus, they can be regarded as extensions of the ordinary partial differential operators. An analogue of the Laplace operator, called h-Laplacian, is defined by

$$\Delta_h = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathcal{D}_i^2,$$

which shares many properties of the ordinary Laplacian. In terms of ordinary differential operators ∇ and Δ, the h-Laplacian is given explicitly by

$$\Delta_h = \Delta + \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \left(\frac{2\,v\cdot\nabla}{\langle v, x\rangle} - \|v\|^2 \frac{I-\rho_v}{\langle x, v\rangle^2} \right).$$

In spherical polar coordinates, the h-Laplacian satisfies the relation

$$\Delta_h = \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{2\lambda_\kappa+1}{r}\frac{d}{dr} + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_{h,0}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\Delta_{h,0}$ denotes the h-Laplace-Beltrami operator that acts only on ξ and

$$\lambda_\kappa := \gamma_\kappa + \frac{d-2}{2} \quad \text{with} \quad \gamma_\kappa := \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v. \tag{2.6}$$

2.3. **h-harmonics and orthogonal expansions.**

A homogeneous polynomial Y on $\mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfies $\Delta_{h,0} Y = 0$ is called an h-harmonic polynomial. The restriction of such polynomials on the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ are called h-spherical harmonics, which are orthogonal with respect to the inner product of $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)$, where

$$h_\kappa(x) := \prod_{v\in R_+} |\langle x, v\rangle|^{\kappa_v}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.7}$$

More precisely, let $\mathcal{H}_n^d(h_\kappa^2)$ denote the space of h-harmonics of degree n in $\mathbb{R}^d$; then for $Y_n \in \mathcal{H}_n^d(h_\kappa^2)$ with $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} Y_n(x) Y_m(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) = 0, \qquad n \neq m.$$

The space of $\mathcal{H}_n^d(h_k^2)$ consists of the eigenfunctions of the h-Laplace-Beltrami operator, that is,

$$\Delta_{h,0} Y(x) = -n(n + 2\lambda_\kappa) Y(x), \qquad Y \in \mathcal{H}_n^d(h_\kappa^2). \tag{2.8}$$

Let us denote by $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)$ the space of measurable functions f for which

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)} := \left(\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \right)^{1/2}$$

are finite, where ω_d^κ denotes the normalization constant

$$\omega_d^\kappa := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x).$$

Let $\operatorname{proj}_n^\kappa : L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2) \mapsto \mathcal{H}_n^d(h_\kappa^2)$ be the orthogonal projection operator. The standard Hilbert space argument shows that

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{proj}_n^\kappa f(x), \qquad f \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2),$$

where the equality holds in the L^2 sense. Since $\operatorname{proj}_n^\kappa f \in \mathcal{H}_n^d(h_\kappa^2)$, it follows from (2.8) that

$$(-\Delta_{h,0})^r f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (n(n + 2\lambda_k))^r \operatorname{proj}_n^\kappa f(x) \tag{2.9}$$

for r being a positive integer. Furthermore, we can use (2.9) as the definition of $(-\Delta_{h,0})^r$ for r being any real number.

3. RELATIONS OF DIFFERENTIAL-DIFFERENCE OPERATORS

The Dunkl operators $\mathcal{D}_j$ play the role of differential operators ∂_j in the setting of reflection group. We define an analogue of the gradient vector as

$$\nabla_h := (\mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_d).$$

The next lemma defines $\nabla_{h,0}$, which is an analogue of the spherical gradient.

Lemma 3.1. *In the spherical polar coordinates $x = r\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $r > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have*

$$\nabla_h = \xi \frac{d}{dr} + \frac{1}{r} \nabla_{h,0}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\nabla_{h,0}$, an analogue of the spherical gradient, satisfies

$$\nabla_{h,0} f(\xi) = \nabla_0 f(\xi) + \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v E_v f(\xi) v, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. By definition, $\nabla_h = \nabla + E$, where $E = \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v E_v v$. Since we evidently have

$$E_v f(r\xi) = \frac{1}{r} \frac{f(r\xi) - f(r\xi\sigma_v)}{\langle v, \xi \rangle},$$

the stated results follow immediately from this identity and (2.1). $\square$

Despite extensive studies of Dunkl operators and associated harmonic analysis (see, for example, [1, 4]), the operator $\nabla_{h,0}$ and its relation with $\Delta_{h,0}$ and the operators $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$, which are analogues of $D_{i,j}$ to be defined later, have not been studied much in the literature. In the rest of this section, we will study relations between these operators carefully.

We start with a simple, yet important, observation on $\nabla_{h,0}$.

Lemma 3.2. *For $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,*

$$\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(\xi) = \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v \big[f(\xi) - f(\xi\sigma_v) \big]. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. The definition shows immediately that $\langle \xi, v\rangle E_v f(\xi) = f(\xi) - f(\xi\sigma_v)$. Hence, by $\xi \cdot \nabla_0 f(\xi) = 0$, (3.3) follows from (3.2). □

This lemma captures a major difference between ordinary spherical gradient, for which $\xi \cdot \nabla_0 = 0$, and the h-spherical gradient, as seen from our next proposition and several later results.

Proposition 3.3. *For $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have*

$$\Delta_{h,0} = \nabla_{h,0} \cdot \nabla_{h,0} - \xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Since $\Delta_h = \nabla_h \cdot \nabla_h$, it follows from the relation (3.1) that

$$\Delta_h = \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{r}(\nabla_{h,0} \cdot \xi)\frac{d}{dr} + \xi \frac{d}{dr}\left(\frac{1}{r}\nabla_{h,0}\right) + \frac{1}{r^2}\nabla_{h,0} \cdot \nabla_{h,0}. \tag{3.5}$$

By the definition of reflection, $\langle \xi\sigma_v, v\rangle = -\langle \xi, v\rangle$, it follows that

$$E_v \langle \xi, v\rangle = \frac{\langle \xi, v\rangle - \langle \xi\sigma_v, v\rangle \sigma_v}{\langle \xi, v\rangle} = \frac{\langle \xi, v\rangle + \langle \xi, v\rangle \sigma_v}{\langle \xi, v\rangle} = I + \sigma_v;$$

moreover, by (2.1), it follows readily that $\nabla_0 \cdot \xi = d-1$. Consequently, by (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{h,0} \cdot \xi &= \nabla \cdot \xi + \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v E_v \langle \xi, v\rangle = d - 1 + \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v (I + \sigma_v) \\ &= d - 1 + 2\gamma_\kappa - \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v (I - \sigma_v) = 2\lambda_\kappa + 1 - \xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

by (3.3). Furthermore, since $\frac{d}{dr}$ commutes with $\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0}$,

$$\xi \frac{d}{dr}\left(\frac{1}{r}\nabla_{h,0}\right) = -\frac{1}{r^2}\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} + (\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0})\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}.$$

Inserting the last two displayed identities into (3.5) shows that

$$\Delta_h = \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{2\lambda_\kappa + 1}{r}\frac{d}{dr} + \frac{1}{r^2}\left(\nabla_{h,0} \cdot \nabla_{h,0} - \xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0}\right),$$

which proves, upon comparing with (2.5), the identity (3.4). □

We now define analogues of the angular derivatives $D_{i,j}$.

Definition 3.4. *For $1 \le i, j \le d$, define differential-difference operators*

$$\mathcal{D}_{i,j} := x_i \mathcal{D}_j - x_j \mathcal{D}_i.$$

By the definition of $D_{i,j}$, we can write

$$\mathcal{D}_{i,j} = D_{i,j} + E_{i,j}, \qquad E_{i,j} := \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v (x_i v_j - x_j v_i) E_v. \tag{3.7}$$

Proposition 3.5. *For* $f, g \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ *and* $1 \le i < j \le d$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{D}_{i,j} f(x) g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) = -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) \mathcal{D}_{i,j} g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x). \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. Let us first assume that $\kappa_v \ge 1$, so that $h_\kappa(x)$ is continuously differentiable. In particular, we have then

$$\partial_i \left(g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) \right) = (\partial_i g(x)) h_\kappa^2(x) + g(x) \sum_{v \in R_+} 2\kappa_v \frac{h_\kappa^2(x)}{\langle x, v \rangle} v_i,$$

which yields immediately the relation

$$D_{i,j} \left(g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) \right) = D_{i,j} g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) + g(x) \sum_{v \in R_+} 2\kappa_v \frac{h_\kappa^2(x)}{\langle x, v \rangle} (x_i v_j - x_j v_i).$$

By the identity (2.4), the differential part of $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ then satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} D_{i,j} f(x) g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) &= -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) D_{i,j} \left(g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) \right) d\sigma(x) \\ &= -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) D_{i,j} g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) g(x) \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v \frac{x_i v_j - x_j v_i}{\langle x, v \rangle} h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x). \end{aligned}$$

Next we consider $E_{i,j}$ term. By the definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} E_{i,j} f(x) g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) = \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v \Bigg[&\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (x_i v_j - x_j v_i) \frac{f(x) g(x)}{\langle x, v \rangle} h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (x_i v_j - x_j v_i) \frac{f(x\sigma_v) g(x)}{\langle x, v \rangle} h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \Bigg]. \end{aligned}$$

In the last integral in the right hand side, we make a change of variables $x \mapsto x\sigma_v$. Since $h_\kappa^2(x)$ is invariant under the reflection group, $\langle x\sigma_v, v \rangle = \langle x, v\sigma_v \rangle = -\langle x, v \rangle$ by the definition of σ_v and

$$(x\sigma_v)_i v_j - (x\sigma_v)_j v_i = x_i v_j - x_j v_i - \frac{2\langle x, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} (v_i v_j - v_j v_i) = x_i v_j - x_j v_i,$$

we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (x_i v_j - x_j v_i) \frac{f(x\sigma_v) g(x)}{\langle x, v \rangle} h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma = -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (x_i v_j - x_j v_i) \frac{f(x) g(x\sigma_v)}{\langle x, v \rangle} h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma.$$

Consequently, the difference part of $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} E_{i,j} f(x) g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) &= -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) E_{i,j} g(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) g(x) \frac{x_i v_j - x_j v_i}{\langle x, v \rangle} h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.7), summing up the integral relations for $D_{i,j}$ and $E_{i,j}$ proves (3.8). This completes the proof under the assumption of $\kappa_v \ge 1$. The general case of $\kappa_v \ge 0$ follows from analytic continuation. □

Our next proposition gives an expression of $\nabla_{h,0}$ in terms of $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$.

Proposition 3.6. *The jth component of $\nabla_{h,0}$ satisfies*

$$(\nabla_{h,0})_j f(\xi) = \sum_{i=1, i\ne j}^{d} \xi_i \mathcal{D}_{i,j} f(\xi) + \xi_j (\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0}), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. For the classical spherical gradient ∇_0, we know that

$$(\nabla_0)_j f(\xi) = \sum_{i=1, i\ne j}^{d} \xi_i D_{i,j} f(\xi), \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}.$$

By (3.2), we can then write

$$(\nabla_{h,0})_j f(\xi) = \sum_{i=1, i\ne j}^{d} \xi_i D_{i,j} f(\xi) + \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v E_v f(\xi) v_j.$$

By the definition of $E_{i,j}$ and setting $E_{i,i} := 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \xi_i E_{i,j} f(\xi) = \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v E_v f(\xi) \sum_{i=1}^{d} \xi_i(\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i) = \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v E_v f(\xi)(v_j - \xi_j \langle \xi, v\rangle),$$

which leads to, upon rearranging and using the definition of E_v, that

$$\sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v E_v f(\xi) v_j = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \xi_i E_{i,j} f(\xi) + \xi_j \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v (f(\xi) - f(\xi\sigma_v)).$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} = D_{i,j} + E_{i,j}$, (3.9) follows from the above relations and (3.3). □

Our next goal is to derive an adjoint of $\nabla_{h,0}$, for which we need a lemma whose proof relies on the following identity ([4, p. 156]): For $1 \le i, j \le d$,

$$\mathcal{D}_i(x_j f(x)) = x_j \mathcal{D}_i f(x) + \delta_{i,j} f(x) + 2 \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \frac{v_i v_j}{\|v\|^2} f(x\sigma_v). \tag{3.10}$$

Lemma 3.7. *For $1 \le i < j \le d$,*

$$\sum_{i=1, i\ne j}^{d} \mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\xi_j g(\xi)) = (\nabla_{h,0})_j g(\xi) - (\gamma_\kappa + d - 1)\xi_j g(\xi) - \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v (\xi\sigma_v)_j g(\xi\sigma_v).$$

Proof. Using the identity in the previous lemma, it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\xi_i g(\xi)) = \xi_j \mathcal{D}_{i,j} g(\xi) - \xi_i g(\xi) + 2 \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \frac{\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i}{\|v\|^2} v_j g(\xi\sigma_v).$$

By $\sum_{j=1}^{d} (\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i) v_i = v_j \langle \xi, v\rangle - \xi_j \|v\|^2$ and the definition of $\xi\sigma_v$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1, i\ne j}^{d} \mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\xi g(\xi)) = \sum_{i=1, i\ne j}^{d} \xi_i D_{i,j} g(\xi) - (d-1)\xi_j g(\xi) - \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \left(\xi_j + (\xi\sigma_v)_j\right) g(\xi\sigma_v).$$

Applying the identity (3.9) one more time shows that

$$\sum_{i=1, i\neq j}^{d} \mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\xi g(\xi)) = (\nabla_{h,0})_j g(\xi) - (d-1)\xi_j g(\xi) - \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \left(\xi_j g(\xi) + (\xi\sigma_v)_j g(\xi\sigma_v)\right),$$

which becomes the stated identity if we break the last sum as two sums and recognize that the first one is equal to $\gamma_\kappa \xi_j g(\xi)$. The proof is completed. $\square$

We are now in a position to identify the adjoint operator of $\nabla_{h,0}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)$, which is given in the following integration by parts formula.

Proposition 3.8. *For $f, g \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} & \nabla_{h,0} f(\xi) g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi) \\ &= -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)\left[\nabla_{h,0} g(\xi) - (2\lambda_\kappa + 1) x g(\xi)\right] h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi). \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. Using the identity (3.9) we can decompose the j-th component of the left hand side of (3.11) as a sum of two integrals,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \xi_i \mathcal{D}_{i,j} f(\xi) g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi), \\ I_2 &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \xi_j (f(\xi) - f(\xi\sigma_v)) g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 we use the identity (3.8) and Lemma 3.7 to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi) \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\xi_i g(\xi)) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi) \\ &= -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)(\nabla_{h,0})_j g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi) + (\gamma_k + d - 1)\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \xi_j f(\xi) g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)(\xi\sigma_v)_j g(\xi\sigma_v) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi), \end{aligned}$$

whereas for I_2, we break the integral as a sum of two integrals and change variable $\xi \mapsto \xi\sigma_v$ in the second one to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \xi_j f(\xi) g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \xi_i f(\xi\sigma_v) g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi) \\ &= \gamma_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \xi_j f(\xi) g(\xi) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi) - \sum_{v\in R_+} \kappa_v \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)(\xi\sigma_v)_j g(\xi\sigma_v) h_\kappa^2(\xi) d\sigma(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Adding the expressions for I_1 and I_2 proves (3.11). $\square$

Our next two propositions give further connections between the operators $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$, the h-spherical gradient $\nabla_{h,0}$ and h-Laplace-Beltrami operator $\Delta_{h,0}$.

Proposition 3.9. *The operators $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ and $\nabla_{h,0}$ satisfy the relation*

$$\nabla_{h,0} f(\xi) \cdot \nabla_{h,0} g(\xi) + (\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(\xi))(\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} g(\xi)) = \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \mathcal{D}_{i,j} f(\xi) \mathcal{D}_{i,j} g(\xi) \tag{3.12}$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. *In particular,*

$$|\nabla_{h,0} f(\xi)|^2 + |\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(\xi)|^2 = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} |\mathcal{D}_{i,j} f(\xi)|^2, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. For simplicity, we denote the right hand side of (3.12) by $[\mathcal{D}f, \mathcal{D}g]$. By the decomposition of $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ in (3.7), we can write

$$[\mathcal{D}f, \mathcal{D}g] = [Df, Dg] + [Df, Eg] + [Ef, Dg] + [Ef, Eg],$$

where the brackets in the right hand side is defined in analogy to $[\mathcal{D}f, \mathcal{D}g]$. By (2.3), we have $[Df, Dg] = \nabla_0 f(x) \cdot \nabla_0 g(x)$. By the definition of $E_{i,j} f$ and the fact that $x_i v_j - x_j v_i = D_{i,j} \langle x, v \rangle$, we have

$$[Df, Eg] = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} D_{i,j} f(\xi) E_{i,j} g(\xi) = \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v E_v g(\xi) \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} D_{i,j} f(\xi) D_{i,j} \langle \xi, v \rangle.$$

Since, by (2.1), we have for $x = r\xi$,

$$\nabla_0 \langle v, \xi \rangle = \frac{1}{r} \nabla_0 \langle v, x \rangle = \nabla \langle v, x \rangle - \xi \frac{d}{dr} \langle v, r\xi \rangle = v - \langle v, \xi \rangle \xi, \tag{3.14}$$

it follows from (2.3) and $\xi \cdot \nabla_0 f(\xi) = 0$ that

$$\sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} D_{i,j} f(\xi) D_{i,j} \langle \xi, v \rangle = \nabla_0 f(\xi) \cdot \nabla_0 \langle v, \xi \rangle = \nabla_0 f(\xi) \cdot (v - \langle v, \xi \rangle \xi) = \nabla_0 f(\xi) \cdot v.$$

Consequently, we conclude that

$$[Df, Eg] = \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v E_v g(\xi) \nabla_0 f(\xi) \cdot v.$$

Reversing the role of f and g, we obtain an analogue expression for $[Ef, Dg]$. Furthermore, the above consideration also shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} (\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i)(\xi_i u_j - \xi_j u_i) &= \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} D_{i,j} \langle v, \xi \rangle D_{i,j} \langle u, \xi \rangle \\ &= \nabla_0 \langle v, \xi \rangle \cdot \nabla_0 \langle u, \xi \rangle = \langle v, u \rangle - \langle v, \xi \rangle \langle u, \xi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

so that, by the definition of $E_{i,j}$ and (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} [Ef, Eg] = & \sum_{v \in R_+} \sum_{u \in R_+} \kappa_v \kappa_u E_v f(\xi) E_u g(\xi) \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} (\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i)(\xi_i u_j - \xi_j u_i) \\ & - \sum_{v \in R_+} \sum_{u \in R_+} \kappa_v \kappa_u E_v f(\xi) E_u g(\xi) \langle v, \xi \rangle \langle u, \xi \rangle \\ = & \sum_{v \in R_+} \sum_{u \in R_+} \kappa_v \kappa_u E_v f(\xi) E_u g(\xi) \langle v, u \rangle - (\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(\xi))(\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} g(\xi)). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up these expressions, we deduce then

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] = & - (\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(\xi))(\xi \cdot \nabla_{h,0} g(\xi)) + \nabla_0 f(\xi) \cdot \nabla_0 g(\xi) + \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v E_v g(\xi) \nabla_0 f(\xi) \cdot v \\ & + \sum_{v \in R_+} \kappa_v E_v f(\xi) \nabla_0 g(\xi) \cdot v + \sum_{v \in R_+} \sum_{u \in R_+} \kappa_v \kappa_u E_v f(\xi) E_u g(\xi) \langle v, u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By the decomposition (3.2), the last four terms in the right hand side of the above expression is precisely $\nabla_{h,0} f(\xi) \cdot \nabla_{h,0} g(\xi)$. This completes the proof. □

Proposition 3.10. *For $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,*

$$\Delta_{h,0} = \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \mathcal{D}_{i,j}^2 + (\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0})^2 + (d-2)(\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0}). \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. We start with the main term in the right hand side. Since $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} = D_{i,j} + E_{i,j}$, we can write

$$\sum_{i<j} \mathcal{D}_{i,j}^2 = \sum_{i<j} D_{i,j}^2 + \sum_{i<j} D_{i,j}E_{i,j} + \sum_{i<j} E_{i,j}D_{i,j} + \sum_{i<j} E_{i,j}^2. \tag{3.16}$$

The first term in the right hand side, by (2.2), is equal to $\Delta_0 = \nabla_0\cdot\nabla_0$. For the second term, we use the fact that $\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i = D_{i,j}\langle \xi, v\rangle$ and the fact that $D_{i,j}$ is a derivation to write it as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i<j} D_{i,j}E_{i,j} &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v \sum_{1\le i<j\le d}\big(D_{i,j}^2\langle\xi,v\rangle)E_v + D_{i,j}\langle\xi,v\rangle D_{i,j}E_v\big)\\ &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v(\Delta_0\langle\xi,v\rangle)E_v + \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v(\nabla_0\langle\xi,v\rangle)\cdot\nabla_0 E_v\end{aligned}$$

by (2.2) and (2.3). Now, by (2.1), it is easy to see that $\Delta_0\langle\xi,v\rangle = -(d-1)\langle\xi,v\rangle$, which implies, together with (3.14), that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i<j} D_{i,j}E_{i,j} =& -(d-1)\sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v\langle\xi,v\rangle E_v + \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v\left(v\cdot\nabla_0 E_v - \langle v,\xi\rangle\xi\cdot\nabla_0 E_v\right)\\ =& -(d-1)\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0} + \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v v\cdot\nabla_0 E_v\end{aligned}$$

upon using (3.3) and the fact that $\xi\cdot\nabla_0 = 0$. The third term in the right hand side of (3.16) is

$$\sum_{i<j} E_{i,j}D_{i,j} = \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v\sum_{i<j}(\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i)E_v D_{i,j}.$$

Using the definition of E_v and $(\xi\sigma_v)_j = \xi_j - 2\langle\xi,v\rangle v_j/\|v\|^2$, we see that

$$E_v(\xi_i v_j f(\xi)) = \frac{\xi v_j f(\xi) - v_i(\xi\sigma_v)_j f(\xi\sigma_v)}{\langle\xi,v\rangle} = \xi v_j E_v f(\xi) + \frac{2\langle\xi,v\rangle}{\|v\|^2}v_i v_j,$$

which implies that $E_v(\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i) = (\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i)E_v$. Hence, using (3.14) and (3.3), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i<j} E_{i,j}D_{i,j} &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v E_v\sum_{i<j}(\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i)D_{i,j} = \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v E_v \sum_{i<j} D_{i,j}\langle\xi,v\rangle D_{i,j}\\ &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v E_v\nabla_0\langle\xi,v\rangle\cdot\nabla_0 = \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v E_v\cdot\nabla_0.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the fourth term in the right hand side of (3.16) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i<j} E_{i,j}^2 &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\sum_{u\in R_+}\kappa_v\kappa_u\sum_{i<j}(\xi_i v_j - \xi_j v_i)(\xi_i u_j - \xi_j u_i)E_v E_u\\ &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\sum_{u\in R_+}\kappa_v\kappa_u\sum_{i<j} D_{i,j}\langle\xi,v\rangle D_{i,j}\langle\xi,u\rangle E_v E_u\end{aligned}$$

By (2.3) and (3.14), it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{i<j} D_{i,j}\langle \xi, v\rangle D_{i,j}\langle \xi, u\rangle = (\nabla_0\langle \xi, v\rangle)\cdot(\nabla_0\langle \xi, u\rangle) \ = \langle v, u\rangle - \langle v, \xi\rangle\langle u, \xi\rangle,$$

which implies, by (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i<j} E_{i,j}^2 &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\sum_{u\in R_+} \kappa_v\kappa_u(\langle v, u\rangle - \langle v, \xi\rangle\langle u, \xi\rangle)E_vE_u \\ &= \sum_{v\in R_+}\sum_{u\in R_+} \kappa_v\kappa_u\langle v, u\rangle E_vE_u - (\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0})^2.\end{aligned}$$

Putting these expressions that we derived for the four terms in the right hand side of (3.16), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i<j}\mathcal{D}_{i,j}^2 =& \nabla_0\cdot\nabla_0 + \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v v\cdot\nabla_0 E_v + \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v E_v\cdot\nabla_0 \\ &+ \sum_{v\in R_+}\sum_{u\in R_+}\kappa_v\kappa_u\langle v, u\rangle E_vE_u - (d-1)\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0} - (\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0})^2.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the expression of $\nabla_{h,0}$ in (3.2), it follows from (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{h,0} + \xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0} =& \nabla_0\cdot\nabla_0 + \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v v\cdot\nabla_0 E_v \\ &+ \sum_{v\in R_+}\kappa_v E_v v\cdot\nabla_0 + \sum_{v\in R_+}\sum_{u\in R_+}\kappa_v\kappa_u\langle v, u\rangle E_vE_u.\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the last two displayed equations proves (3.15). □

It is worth mentioning that $\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0}$ appear in the previous two propositions. For ordinary derivatives, $\xi\cdot\nabla_0 = 0$.

As a final result in this section, we state a relation between the L^2 norm of $\nabla_{h,0}f$ and $(-\Delta_{h,0})^{\frac12}f$, which will be used in the next section. For the classical differential operators, the L^2 norm of ∇_0 and $(-\Delta_0)^{\frac12}$ are equal. The equality, however, holds only for invariant functions in the weighted setting.

Corollary 3.11. *The operator $-\Delta_{h,0}$ is self-adjoint with respect to $h_\kappa^2 d\sigma$ and*

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|(-\Delta_{h,0})^{\frac12}f\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} =& \|\nabla_{h,0}f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} - \|(\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0})f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \\ &- (d-2)\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0}f(\xi)f(\xi)h_\kappa^2(\xi)d\sigma(\xi).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By (3.3), it is easy to see that the operator $\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0}$ is self-adjoint. Hence, since $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}^2$ is self-adjoint, it follows by (3.15) that $\Delta_{h,0}$ is self-adjoint. As a result, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|(-\Delta_{h,0})^{\frac{1}{2}}f\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} =&\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)(-\Delta_{h,0})f(\xi)h_\kappa^2(\xi)d\sigma\\ =&-\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)\sum_{1\le i<j\le d}\mathcal{D}_{i,j}^2 f(\xi)h_\kappa^2(\xi)d\sigma\\ &-\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)(\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0})^2 f(\xi)h_\kappa^2(\xi)d\sigma\\ &-(d-2)\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(\xi)(\xi\cdot\nabla_{h,0})f(\xi)h_\kappa^2(\xi)d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts by (3.8) and using (3.12), the first integral in the right hand side is precisely $\|\nabla_{h,0}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}$, which proves the stated identity. $\square$

4. Uncertainty principles on weighted space on the unit sphere

In this section we study uncertainty principle on the weighted space. We denote by $W_2^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)$ the weighted Sobolev space

$$W_2^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2) := \left\{f\in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2) : \nabla_{h,0}f\in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)\right\}.$$

Since the measure $h_\kappa^2 d\sigma$ is no longer invariant under the entire orthogonal group, we can no longer expect an inequality that holds with minimal taken over all $e\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ as in (1.1). What we are able to do is to take minimal over all the coordinate plans as shall be seen below.

For our first result on the uncertainty principle, we consider functions that are invariant under a reflection group G. Recall that the weight function h_κ associated with G is defined in (2.7) and the constant λ_κ is defined in (2.6).

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f\in W_2^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)$ be invariant under the reflection group G and assume $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}f(x)h_\kappa^2(x)d\sigma=0$ and $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}=1$. Then*

$$\min_{1\le i\le d}\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(1-x_i)|f(x)|^2h_\kappa^2(x)d\sigma\,\|\nabla_0 f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}\ge C_{\kappa,d}, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$C_{\kappa,d}=2\lambda_\kappa\left(1-\frac{\sqrt{2\lambda_\kappa}}{\sqrt{(\lambda_\kappa+\frac{1}{2})^2+2\lambda_\kappa}}\right).$$

Proof. For convenience, we set

$$r:=\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(1-x_i)|f(x)|^2h_\kappa^2(x)d\sigma(x)\quad\text{and}\quad Lf:=r\|\nabla_0 f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}.$$

Our goal is to show that Lf is bounded below by a constant. Since $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}=1$, it is evident that $r\in(0,2)$. By (3.11) with $g=f$, we have

$$(2\lambda_\kappa+1)\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}x|f(x)|^2h_\kappa^2(x)d\sigma=2\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}f(x)\nabla_{h,0}f(x)h_\kappa^2(x)d\sigma. \tag{4.2}$$

Since f is invariant under the reflection group, $\nabla_{h,0} = \nabla_0$ and $x \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(x) = 0$ by (3.3). Hence, for $1 \le i \le d$,

$$\begin{aligned}|x_i(\nabla_{h,0})_i f(x)|^2 = \sum_{j\ne i}^{d} |x_j(\nabla_0)_j f(x)|^2 &\le \sum_{j\ne i} x_j^2 \sum_{j \ne i} |(\nabla_0)_j f(x)|^2 \\ &\le (1-x_i)^2 \sum_{j\ne i} |(\nabla_0)_j f(x)|^2 ,\end{aligned}$$

which implies immediately that

$$|(\nabla_0)_i f(x)|^2 = |x_i(\nabla_0)_i f(x)|^2 + (1-x_i)^2 |(\nabla_0)_i f(x)|^2 \le (1-x_i)^2 |\nabla_0 f(x)|^2 .$$

Consequently, applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality on the ith component of (4.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda_\kappa + \tfrac12)^2 |1-r|^2 &= \frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x)(\nabla_0)_i f(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma \right|^2 \\ &\le \frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (1-x_i)^2 |f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma \|\nabla_0 f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} = 1$, the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality shows that

$$\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |f(x)|^2 x_1^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \ge \left| \frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |f(x)|^2 x_1 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \right|^2 = (1-r)^2,$$

from which it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |f(x)|^2 (1-x_1^2) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \le 1-(1-r)^2 = (2-r)r. \tag{4.3}$$

Consequently, we conclude that

$$(\lambda_\kappa + \tfrac12)^2 (1-r)^2 \le (2-r) r \|\nabla_0 f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} = (2-r) Lf$$

or, equivalently,

$$Lf \ge (\lambda_\kappa + \tfrac12)^2 \frac{(1-r)^2}{2-r}. \tag{4.4}$$

On the other hand, by (2.8) and the assumption that $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) d\sigma(x) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}1 = \|f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|\operatorname{proj}_n f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2\lambda_\kappa} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n+2\lambda_\kappa) \|\operatorname{proj}_n f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} = \frac{1}{2\lambda_\kappa} \|(-\Delta_{h,0})^{\frac12} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since f is invariant under the reflection group, it follows from (3.3) and Corollary 3.11 that $\|\Delta_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} = \|\nabla_0 f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}$, which implies that $Lf = r\|\nabla_0 f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \ge 2\lambda_\kappa r$. Together with (4.4), we have shown that

$$Lf \ge \max\left\{ (\lambda_\kappa + \tfrac12)^2 \frac{(1-r)^2}{2-r}, 2\lambda_\kappa r \right\} \ge \min_{t\in(0,2)} \max\left\{ (\lambda_\kappa + \tfrac12)^2 \frac{(1-t)^2}{2-t}, 2\lambda_\kappa t \right\}.$$

Since $(1-t)^2/(2-t)$ is decreasing on $(0,2)$, it is easy to see that the value of the right hand side is attained when the two terms are equal, which proves (4.1). □

If f is not invariant under the reflection group, the above proof breaks down. Indeed, in that case, we no longer have $|(\nabla_{h,0})_i f(x)|^2 \le (1-x_i^2)|\nabla_{h,0} f(x)|^2$ since such an inequality would imply, by (3.9), that $x \cdot \nabla_{h,0}(x) = 0$ for $x_i = 0$, which does not hold in general.

One naturally asks if it is possible to establish an uncertainty principle for functions that are not necessarily invariant. Our next result shows that, under a mild condition on κ, such a result can hold in the case of $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^d$.

For $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^d$, the weight function h_κ is defined by

$$h_\kappa(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d |x_i|^{\kappa_i}, \qquad \kappa_i \ge 0,$$

and the Dunkl operators are given by the following expression: for $1 \le j \le d$,

$$\mathcal{D}_j f(x) = \partial_j f(x) + \kappa_j E_j f(x), \qquad E_j f(x) := \frac{f(x) - f(x\sigma_j)}{x_j} \tag{4.5}$$

where $x\sigma_j := x - 2x_j e_j$ denotes the sign change in x_i.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^d$ and $h_\kappa(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d |x_i|^{\kappa_i}$. Let $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{S}, h_\kappa^2)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma = 0$ and $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)} = 1$. If at least one $\kappa_j \ne \frac{1}{2}$ for $j = 2, 3, \ldots, d$, then there is a constant $C_{\kappa,d}$, depending on κ and d only, such that*

$$\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (1-x_1)|f(x)|^2 d\sigma(x) \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)} \ge C_{\kappa,d}. \tag{4.6}$$

In particular, if at least two $\kappa_i \ne 1/2$, then

$$\min_{1 \le i \le d} \frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (1-x_i)|f(x)|^2 d\sigma(x) \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)} \ge C_{\kappa,d}.$$

Proof. By (3.10), it follows that

$$\mathcal{D}_i(x_j f(x)) = x_j \mathcal{D}_i f(x) + \delta_{i,j} f(x) + 2\kappa_i \delta_{i,j} f(x\sigma_j),$$

which implies, in particular, that

$$\mathcal{D}_{1,j}(x_j f(x)) = x_j \mathcal{D}_{1,j} f(x) + x_1 f(x) + 2\kappa_j x_1 f(x\sigma_j). \tag{4.7}$$

The integration by part in (3.8) shows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j \mathcal{D}_{1,j} f(x) f(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) = -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) \mathcal{D}_{1,j}(x_j f(x)) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x),$$

which yields, upon applying (4.7), the relation

$$\begin{aligned} 2\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j \mathcal{D}_{1,j} f(x) f(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) = &-\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_1 |f(x)|^2 h_k^2(x) d\sigma \\ &- 2\kappa_j \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_1 f(x) f(x\sigma_j) h_k^2(x) d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Furthermore, in this case, it is easy to verify that

$$\mathcal{D}_j[f(x\sigma_j)] = -(\mathcal{D}_j f)(x\sigma_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_i[f(x\sigma_j)] = (\mathcal{D}_i f)(x\sigma_j), \quad i \ne j,$$

which implies, since $x_j = -(x\sigma_j)_j$, that for $i \ne j$,

$$\mathcal{D}_{i,j}(f(x\sigma_j)) = -x_i(\mathcal{D}_j f)(x\sigma_j) - x_j(\mathcal{D}_i f)(x\sigma_j) = -(\mathcal{D}_{i,j} f)(x\sigma_j).$$

Consequently, replacing $f(x)$ by $f(x\sigma_j)$ in (4.7) shows that, for $j \ge 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{1,j}(x_j f(x\sigma_j)) &= x_j \mathcal{D}_{1,j}(f(x\sigma_j)) + x_1 f(x\sigma_j) + 2\kappa_j x_1 f(x)\\ &= -x_j(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x\sigma_j) + x_1 f(x\sigma_j) + 2\kappa_j x_1 f(x).\end{aligned}$$

Now, changing variable $x \mapsto x\sigma_j$ and applying (3.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j f(x)(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x\sigma_j) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma &= -\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j f(x\sigma_j) \mathcal{D}_{1,j} f(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) \mathcal{D}_{1,j}(x_j f(x\sigma_j)) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $(x\sigma_j)_j = -x_j$. Together, the above two displayed equations lead to

$$\begin{aligned}2\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j f(x)(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x\sigma_j) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma = &\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_1 f(x) f(x\sigma_j) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma\\ &+ 2\kappa_j \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_1 |f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

Combining with (4.8), we conclude that, for $j \ge 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}(4\kappa_j^2 - 1)\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_1 |f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma = &4\kappa_j \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j f(x)(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x\sigma_j) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma\\ &+ 2\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j f(x)(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma.\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (3.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j f(x)(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma\right|^2\\ &\qquad \le \frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j^2 |f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using the invariance of $h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma$ under $x \mapsto x\sigma_j$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j f(x)(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x\sigma_j) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma\right|^2\\ &\qquad = \left|\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (x\sigma_j)_j f(x\sigma_j)(\mathcal{D}_{1,j} f)(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma\right|^2\\ &\qquad \le \frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_j^2 |f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, setting

$$r := \frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (1 - x_1)|f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma(x) \quad \text{and} \quad Lf := r\|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)},$$

we then deduce from (4.9), by the above estimates and $x_j^2 \le 1 - x_1^2$, that

$$\begin{aligned}(4\kappa_j^2 - 1)|1 - r|^2 &= (4\kappa_j^2 - 1)\left|\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x_1 |f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma\right|\\ &\le (4\kappa_j + 2)\frac{1}{\omega_d^\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (1 - x_1^2)|f(x)|^2 h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)},\end{aligned}$$

which implies, by (4.3), that for $j \ge 2$,

$$Lf \ge \frac{(4\kappa_j^2 - 1)(1-r)^2}{(4\kappa_j + 2)(2-r)}.$$

As in the previous proof, our goal is to shows that Lf is bounded below by a constant. Again, $r \in (0,2)$ since $\|f\|_{\kappa,2} = 1$. If $\kappa_j \ne 1/2$ for some $j \ge 2$, then the above inequality gives an nontrivial lower bound of Lf.

On the other hand, the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality shows that $|x \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(x)| \le \|x\| |\nabla_{h,0} f(x)|$, so that by Corollary 3.11 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta_{h,0})^{\frac12} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} &\le \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} + 2\lambda_\kappa \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} x \cdot \nabla_{h,0} f(x) f(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma \right| \\ &\le \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} + 2\lambda_\kappa \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \end{aligned}$$

as $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} = 1$. Consequently, as in the proof of the previous theorem, we deduce from (2.8) and the assumption that $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(x) h_\kappa^2(x) d\sigma = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\le \frac{1}{2\lambda_\kappa} \|(-\Delta_{h,0})^{\frac12} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2\lambda_\kappa} \left(\|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} + 2\lambda_\kappa \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies, as a simple calculation shows, that

$$\|\nabla_{h,0} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \ge \sqrt{\lambda_\kappa^2 + 2\lambda_\kappa} - \lambda_\kappa = \frac{2\lambda_k}{\sqrt{\lambda_\kappa^2 + 2\lambda_\kappa} + \lambda_\kappa}.$$

Hence, it follows that $Lf = r \|\nabla_{h,0} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)} \ge B_\kappa r$. Together with (4.4), we have shown that

$$Lf \ge \max\left\{ A_\kappa \frac{(1-r)^2}{2-r}, B_\kappa r \right\} \ge \min_{t \in (0,2)} \max\left\{ A_\kappa \frac{(1-t)^2}{2-t}, B_\kappa t \right\},$$

which proves, as in the proof of the previous theorem, the stated inequality. $\square$

A couple of remarks are in order. First of all, we do not know if the assumption that at least one $\kappa_i \ne 1/2$ is necessary. Second, the operator $\nabla_{h,0}$ contains a difference part. It is not clear how the space $W_2^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)$ compares with the usual Sobolev space defined solely by differential operators, or how it is compared with the space defied via $(-\Delta_0)^\alpha$ (see, for example, [12]). Thirdly, the optimal constant $C_{\kappa,d}$ for our uncertainty inequalities are not known; in fact, this constant is unknown for the unweighted inequality (1.1). We did not try to find the best constant we can in the proof of Theorem 4.2. In fact, following another approach in [2] based on orthogonal expansion, it is possible to establish (4.6), under a more restricted constrain on κ, with a better constant than the proof of Theorem 4.2 could offer; the constant, however, is still not optimal.

5. UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE ON THE UNIT BALL

There is a close relation between analysis on the unit sphere and on the unit ball (see [4]), which can be used to derive uncertainty inequalities on the unit ball from the results in the previous section.

Let $h_\kappa(x)$ be the reflection invariant weight function defined in (2.7) for a given reflection group G and a multiplicity function κ. For $\mu \ge 0$, we consider the weight function

$$W_{\kappa,\mu}(x) := h_\kappa^2(x)(1-\|x\|^2)^{\mu-1/2}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{B}^d. \tag{5.1}$$

Evidently $W_{\kappa,\mu}$ is invariant under the reflection group G. When $\kappa = 0$ or $h_\kappa(x) = 1$, it becomes the classical rotation invariant weight function

$$W_\mu(x) := (1-\|x\|^2)^{\mu-1/2}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{B}^d.$$

Let $L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})$ denote the space of measurable functions for which

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d,W_{\kappa,\mu})} = \left(b_{\kappa,\mu} \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} |f(x)|^2 W_{\kappa,\mu}(x)dx \right)^{1/2}$$

are finite, where $b_{\kappa,\mu}$ denotes the normalization constant so that $\|1\|_{W_{\kappa,\mu},2} = 1$. For simplicity, let us define $W_2^1(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})$ to be the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})$ for which all first order derivatives of its elements are in $L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})$.

The weight function $W_{\kappa,\mu}$ is known to be closely related to the weight function

$$h_{\kappa,\mu}(x, x_{d+1}) = h_\kappa^2(x)|x_{d+1}|^{2\mu}, \quad (x, x_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{S}^d,$$

which is invariant under the reflection group $G \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ acting on $\mathbb{S}^d$. Let $\mathbb{S}_+^\delta$ denote the north hemisphere defined by $\mathbb{S}_+^d := \{(x, x_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{S}^d : x_{d+1} \ge 0\}$. Then the connection between the two weight functions is established through

$$(x, x_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{S}_+^d \mapsto x \in \mathbb{B}^d,$$

which is clearly a bijection. Under this map, it follows that (cf. [4, Sec. .8])

$$\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^d,h^2_{\kappa,\mu})} = \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d,W_{\kappa,\mu})}, \qquad \text{if} \quad F(x, x_{d+1}) = f(x). \tag{5.2}$$

Recall that $D_{i,j} = x_i\partial_j - x_j\partial_i$ for $i \ne j$. We introduce the notation ∇_D that satisfies

$$|\nabla_D f(x)|^2 := \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} |D_{i,j} f(x)|^2.$$

Theorem 5.1. *Let $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})$ be invariant under the reflection group G and assume $\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(x)W_{\kappa,\mu}(x)dx = 0$ and $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d,W_{\kappa,\mu})} = 1$. Then*

$$\min_{1\le i\le d} b_{\kappa,\mu} \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} (1-x_i)|f(x)|^2 W_{\kappa,\mu}(x)dx \, |||\nabla f|||^2 \ge C_{\kappa,\mu}, \tag{5.3}$$

where

$$|||\nabla f|||^2 := \|\nabla f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d,W_{\kappa,\mu+1})} + \|\nabla_D f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d,W_{\kappa,\mu})} \tag{5.4}$$

and, with $\lambda_{\kappa,\mu} := \gamma_\kappa + \mu + \frac{d-1}{2}$,

$$C_{\kappa,\mu} = 2\lambda_{\kappa,\mu}\left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2\lambda_{\kappa,\mu}}}{\sqrt{(\lambda_{\kappa,\mu}+\frac12)^2 + 2\lambda_{\kappa,\mu}}}\right).$$

Proof. Let $F(x, x_{d+1}) = f(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$. By (5.2), the uncertainty principle (4.1) would follow from the corresponding (4.6) if we could establish the identity $|||\nabla f||| = \|\nabla_0 F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1},h_\kappa^2)}$.

For $(y, y_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ such that $y_{d+1} \ge 0$, we define a mapping $(y, y_{d+1}) \mapsto (r, x)$, where $0 < r \le 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$, by

$$y_1 = rx_1, \dots, y_d = rx_d, \quad y_{d+1} = rx_{d+1}, \quad x_{d+1} = \sqrt{1 - x_1^2 - \cdots - x_d^2}.$$

It is easy to see that this is a bijection and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} &= x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} - x_i(x \cdot \nabla^{(x)})\right), \quad 1 \le i \le d,\\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{d+1}} &= x_{d+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r}\left(-x_{d+1}(x \cdot \nabla^{(x)})\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla^{(x)}$ is the gradient in the variables x in $\mathbb{R}^d$, which implies, by (2.1), that

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_0)_i &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} - x_i(x \cdot \nabla^{(x)}), \quad 1 \le i \le d,\\ (\nabla_0)_{d+1} &= -x_{d+1}(x \cdot \nabla^{(x)}),\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where ∇_0 is the spherical gradient on $\mathbb{S}^d$. It follows then that

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla_0 F(x, x_{d+1})|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} |(\nabla_0)_i F(x)|^2\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} - x_i(x \cdot \nabla f(x))\right)^2 + (x_{d+1}(x \cdot \nabla f(x)))^2\\ &= |\nabla f(x)|^2 - 2(x \cdot \nabla f(x))^2 + \|x\|^2 (x \cdot \nabla f(x))^2 + x_{d+1}^2 (x \cdot \nabla f(x))^2\\ &= |\nabla f(x)|^2 - (x \cdot \nabla f(x))^2. \qquad (5.6)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, a simple computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} |D_{i,j} f(x)|^2 &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{d}\sum_{j=1}^{d}(x_i \partial_j f(x) - x_j \partial_i f(x))^2\\ &= \|x\|^2 |\nabla f(x)|^2 - (x \cdot \nabla f(x))^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Putting these two identities together, we obtain

$$|\nabla F(x, x_{d+1})|^2 = (1 - \|x\|^2)|\nabla f(x)|^2 + \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} |D_{i,j} f(x)|^2,$$

which implies, by (5.2), that $|||\nabla f||| = \|\nabla_0 F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)}$. The proof is completed. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{V}_n^d(W_{\kappa,\mu})$ denote the space of orthogonal polynomials of degree n with respect to $W_{\kappa,\mu}$ on $\mathbb{B}^d$. It is known that $\mathcal{V}_n^d(W_{\kappa,\mu})$ is a space of eigenfunctions of a second order differential-difference operator $\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\mu}$ defined by ([11])

$$\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\mu} := \Delta_h - (x \cdot \nabla)^2 + 2\lambda_{\kappa,\mu}(x \cdot \nabla);$$

more precisely, we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\mu} P = -n(n + 2\lambda_\kappa)P, \qquad \forall P \in \mathcal{V}_n^d(W_{\kappa,\mu}). \tag{5.8}$$

Furthermore, let $\mathrm{proj}_n(W_{\kappa,\mu})$ be the projection operator

$$\mathrm{proj}_n(W_{\kappa,\mu}) : L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu}) \mapsto \mathcal{V}_n^d(W_{\kappa,\mu}).$$

Then (5.8) holds for $P = \operatorname{proj}_n(W_{\kappa,\mu})f$, which can be used to define the fractional power of $\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\mu}$. It is known that $\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\mu}$ is related to $\Delta_{h,0}$ associated with $h_{\kappa,\mu}$. In particular, for functions invariant under the reflection group, we have the relation

$$|||\nabla f||| = \left\|(-\mathcal{D}_{\kappa,\mu})^{1/2} f\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})}.$$

In the case of the classical weight function W_μ, there is no need to assume that f is invariant under a reflection group.

Theorem 5.2. *For the classical weight function W_μ with $\mu \ge 0$, let $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{B}^d, W_\mu)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(x) W_\mu(x)dx = 0$ and $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_\mu)} = 1$. Then*

$$\min_{e\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} b_\mu \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} (1-\langle x,e\rangle)|f(x)|^2 W_\mu(x)dx\, |||\nabla f|||^2 \ge C_\mu, \tag{5.9}$$

where $C_\mu = C_{0,\mu}$, and $|||\nabla f|||$ and $C_{\kappa,\mu}$ are the same as in the previous theorem.

Proof. Since W_μ is invariant under the rotation group, it follows that

$$\min_{e\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} b_\mu \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} (1-\langle x,e\rangle)|f(x)|^2 W_\mu(x)dx = b_\mu \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} (1-x_1)|f(x\tau)|^2 W_\mu(x)dx$$

for some rotation $\tau \in O(d)$. In the proof of the previous theorem, we have shown, by $|||\nabla f||| = \|\nabla_0 F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}, h_\kappa^2)}$ and (5.6), that

$$|||\nabla f|||^2 = b_\mu \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \left[|\nabla f(x)|^2 - (x\cdot\nabla f(x))^2\right] W_\mu(x)dx.$$

Since $\nabla[f(x\tau)] = (\nabla f)(x\tau)$ and, by (2.1), $x\cdot\nabla = r\frac{d}{dr}$ is invariant under the rotation, it follows that $|||f|||$ is rotation invariant. In particular, its value will not change if we replace $f(x)$ by $f(x\tau)$. Hence, (5.9) follows from (5.3). $\square$

The geodesic distance function of the sphere $\mathbb{S}^d$ yields a distance function $\mathtt{d}_\mathbb{B}$ on the unit ball defined by

$$\mathtt{d}_\mathbb{B}(x,y) := \arccos\left(\langle x,y\rangle + \sqrt{1-\|x\|^2}\sqrt{1-\|y\|^2}\right), \qquad x,y\in\mathbb{B}^d.$$

It follows, in particular, that if $y \in \mathbb{B}^d$, then

$$1-\langle x,y\rangle = 1-\cos \mathtt{d}_\mathbb{B}(x,y) = \sin^2\frac{\mathtt{d}_\mathbb{B}(x,y)}{2} \sim \mathtt{d}_\mathbb{B}(x,y)^2.$$

The quantity $|||\nabla f|||$ in (5.9) can be replaced by a more convenient operator norm that involves only partial derivatives instead of $D_{i,j}$.

Corollary 5.3. *Under the assumption of the Theorem 5.2, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{e\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} &\left[b_\mu \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} (1-\langle x,e\rangle)|f(x)|^2 W_\mu(x)dx\right] \\ &\times \left[b_\mu \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \sum_{i=1}^d (1-x_i^2)|\partial_i f(x)|^2 W_\mu(x)dx\right] \ge C_\mu.\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Proof. By the definition of $D_{i,j}$ and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$(D_{i,j}f)^2 = (x_i\partial_j f - x_j\partial_i f)^2 \le 2\left[(x_i\partial_j f)^2 + (x_j\partial_i f)^2\right],$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{1\le i<j\le d} |D_{i,j}f|^2 \le 2 \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \left[(x_i\partial_j f)^2 + (x_j\partial_i f)^2\right]$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d (x_i\partial_j f)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^d (x_i\partial_i f)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d (\|x\|^2 - x_i^2)(\partial_i f)^2.$$

Thus, it follows readily that

$$(1-\|x\|^2)|\nabla f|^2 + |\nabla_D f|^2 \le \sum_{i=1}^d (1-x_i^2)(\partial_i f)^2,$$

so that (5.10) follows from (5.9). □

In the case of $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^d$, we can deduce an uncertainty principle on the unit ball from that of (4.6). In this case, the quantity $|||\nabla f|||$ includes a part of difference operators. Let us use the notation $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}$ that satisfies

$$|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} f(x)|^2 := \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} |\mathcal{D}_{i,j} f(x)|^2.$$

Theorem 5.4. *Let* $h_\kappa(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d |x_i|^{\kappa_i}$ *and assume that* $\kappa_i \ne 1/2$ *for at least two* i. *Let* $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})$ *satisfying* $\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(x) W_{\kappa,\mu}(x)dx = 0$ *and* $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})} = 1$. *Then there is a positive constant* $C_{\kappa,\mu}$, *depending* κ, μ, d *only, such that*

$$\min_{i\in\mathbb{B}^d} b_{\kappa,\mu} \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} (1-x_i)|f(x)|^2 W_{\kappa,\mu}(x)dx\, |||\nabla f|||^2 \ge C_{\kappa,\mu}, \tag{5.11}$$

where

$$|||\nabla f|||^2 := \|\nabla f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu+1})} + \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})} + \|Df\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})}$$

in which

$$Df(x) := \sum_{i=1}^d \kappa_i (f(x) - f(x\sigma_i)).$$

Proof. Using the correspondence of $F(x, x_{d+1}) = f(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$, our main task is to deduce an expression of $\nabla_{h,0} F$. Recall the definition of the Dunkl operators for $\mathbb{Z}_2^d$ in (4.5). By (3.2) and (5.5), we see that

$$(\nabla_{h,0})_i F(x, x_{d+1}) = \mathcal{D}_i f(x) - x_i(x\cdot \nabla f(x)), \quad 1 \le i \le d,$$
$$(\nabla_{h,0})_{d+1} F(x, x_{d+1}) = -x_{d+1}(x\cdot\nabla f(x)).$$

Consequently, it follows that

$$|\nabla_{h,0} F(x, x_{d+1})|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{D}_i f(x) - x_i(x\cdot\nabla f(x))|^2 + |x_{d+1}(x\cdot\nabla f(x))|^2$$
$$= |\nabla_h f(x)|^2 - 2(x\cdot\nabla f(x))(x\cdot\nabla_h f(x)) + (x\cdot\nabla f(x))^2$$
$$= |\nabla_h f(x)|^2 - (x\cdot\nabla_h f(x))^2 + (x\cdot\nabla f(x) - x\cdot\nabla_h f(x))^2$$

It follows directly from the definition of ∇_h that

$$x\cdot\nabla_h f(x) - x\cdot\nabla f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \kappa_i x_i E_i f(x) = Df(x).$$

Furthermore, the identity (5.7) holds with $D_{i,j}$ and ∇ replaced by $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ and ∇_h. Putting these together shows then

$$|\nabla_{h,0} F(x, x_{d+1})|^2 = (1 - \|x\|^2)|\nabla_h f(x)|^2 + \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} |\mathcal{D}_{i,j} f(x)|^2 + |Df(x)|^2,$$

which shows that $\|\nabla_{h,0} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^d, h_\kappa^2)} = |||f|||$ and completes the proof. □

6. Uncertainty principle on the simplex

In this section we use a close relation between analysis on the unit ball and on the simplex

$$\mathbb{T}^d := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 \ge 0, \ldots x_d \ge 0, 1 - |x|_1 \ge 0\},$$

where $|x|_1 = x_1 + \ldots + x_d$, to derive uncertainty principles on the simplex $\mathbb{T}^d$ from the results in the previous section.

Let $h_\kappa(x)$ be the reflection invariant weight function defined in (2.7) for a given reflection group G and a multiplicity function κ. Assume that h_κ is also invariant under the group $\mathbb{Z}_2^d$ of sign changes. For μ , we consider the weight function [11]

$$U_{\kappa,\mu}(x) := \frac{h_\kappa^2(\sqrt{x_1}, \ldots \sqrt{x_d})}{\sqrt{x_1 \cdots x_d}} (1 - |x|_1)^{\mu - 1/2}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

There are essentially two examples of such weight functions, which are given below.

Example 1. Classical Jacobi weight function:

$$U_{\kappa,\mu}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^d |x_i|^{\kappa_i - \frac{1}{2}} (1 - |x|_1)^{\mu - \frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.1}$$

which is associated with the group $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^d$.

Example 2. Weight function associated with the hyperoctahedral group:

$$U_{\kappa,\mu}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^d |x_i|^{\kappa_0 - \frac{1}{2}} \prod_{1 \le i < j \le d} |x_i - x_j|^{\kappa} (1 - |x|_1)^{\mu - \frac{1}{2}}. \tag{6.2}$$

Let $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d, U_{\kappa,\mu})$ denote the space of measurable functions for which

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d, U_{\kappa,\mu})} = \left(b_{\kappa,\mu} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |f(x)|^2 U_{\kappa,\mu}(x) dx \right)^{1/2}$$

are finite, where $b_{\kappa,\mu}$ denotes the normalization constant so that $\|1\|_{U_{\kappa,\mu},2} = 1$. The constant $b_{\kappa,\mu}$ turns out to be the same as the constant for $W_{\kappa,\mu}$ defined in (5.1), as we have

$$W_{\kappa,\mu}(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = J(x)^2 U_{\kappa,\mu}(x_1^2, \ldots x_d^2),$$

where $J(x) = \sqrt{x_1 \cdots x_d}$ is the Jacobian of the changing variables

$$\psi : (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{B}^d \mapsto (x_1^2, \ldots, x_d^2) \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

In fact, under this change of variables, it is known that [4, Sect. 6.2]

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d, U_{\kappa,\mu})} = \|f \circ \psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B}^d, W_{\kappa,\mu})}. \tag{6.3}$$

We can also define the Sobolev space $W_2^1(\mathbb{T}^d, U_{\kappa,\mu})$ similarly as in the case of $\mathbb{B}^d$.

To state our uncertainty principles, let us introduce the differential operators

$$\partial_{i,j} = \partial_i - \partial_j, \qquad 1 \le i < j \le d,$$

and define the following functions on $\mathbb{T}^d$,

$$\varphi_i(x) = \sqrt{x_i(1-|x|_1)}, \quad 1 \le i \le d, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{i,j}(x) = \sqrt{x_i x_j}, \quad 1 \le i < j \le d.$$

Theorem 6.1. *Let* $U_{\kappa,\mu}$ *be the classical Jacobi weight function in* (6.1). *Let* $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{T}^d, U_{\kappa,\mu})$ *satisfying* $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x) U_{\kappa,\mu}(x) dx = 0$ *and* $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d, U_{\kappa,\mu})} = 1$. *Then*

$$\min_{1\le i\le d} b_{\kappa,\mu} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (1-\sqrt{x_i})|f(x)|^2 U_{\kappa,\mu}(x)dx \, |||\partial f|||^2 \ge C_{\kappa,\mu}, \tag{6.4}$$

where

$$|||\partial f|||^2 := \sum_{i=1}^d \|\varphi_i \partial_i f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d,U_{\kappa,\mu})} + \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \|\varphi_{i,j}\partial_{i,j} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d,U_{\kappa,\mu})}. \tag{6.5}$$

and $C_{\kappa,\mu}$ *is equal to* $1/4$ *of the constant in Theorem 5.1.*

Proof. Since $f \circ \psi$ is invariant under $\mathbb{Z}_2^d$, this theorem follows from Theorem 5.1 and (6.3) if we can show that $|||\nabla(f\circ\psi)|||$ in (5.4) is equal to $2|||\partial f|||$ in (6.5).

For $x \in \mathbb{B}^d$, let $F(x) = f\circ\psi(x) = f(x_1^2, \ldots, x_d^2)$. Then $\partial_i F(x) = 2x_i(\partial_i f)\circ\psi(x)$, so that

$$(1-\|x\|^2)|\nabla F(x)|^2 = (1-\|x\|^2)4\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2 |(\partial_i f)\circ\psi(x)|^2 = 4\sum_{i=1}^d |(\phi_i\partial_i f)\circ\psi(x)|^2$$

and

$$|\nabla_D F(x)|^2 = 4\sum_{i=1}^d x_i x_j |(\partial_{i,j} f)\circ\psi(x)|^2 = 4\sum_{i=1}^d |(\phi_{i,j}\partial_{i,j} f)\circ\psi(x)|^2,$$

from which $|||\nabla F||| = |||\partial f|||$ follows by (6.3). $\square$

It is worth mentioning that the connection between the sphere $\mathbb{S}^d$ shows that the distance function on the simplex $\mathbb{T}^d$ inherited from the geometric distance on the sphere is defined by

$$d_{\mathbb{T}}(x,y) = \arccos\left(\sqrt{x_1y_1} + \ldots \sqrt{x_d y_d} + \sqrt{(1-|x|_1)(1-|y|_1)}\right).$$

In particular, with e_j denoting the jth coordinate vector, we see that

$$1-\sqrt{x_j} = 1-\cos d_{\mathbb{T}}(x,e_j) = 2\sin^2\frac{d_{\mathbb{T}}(x,e_j)}{2} \sim d_{\mathbb{T}}(x,e_j)^2.$$

In the case of weight function associated with the hyperoctahedra group, we can state an uncertainty principle for symmetric functions, that is, functions invariant under the symmetric group.

Theorem 6.2. *Let* $U_{\kappa,\mu}$ *be the weight function in* (6.2). *Let* $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{T}^d, U_{\kappa,\mu})$ *be a symmetric function and satisfy* $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x)U_{\kappa,\mu}(x)dx = 0$ *and* $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d,U_{\kappa,\mu})} = 1$. *Then the inequality* (6.4) *holds.*

References

[1] F. Dai and Y. Xu, *Approximation theory and harmonic analysis on spheres and balls*, Springer, New York, 2013.

[2] F. Dai and Y. Xu, The Hardy-Rellich inequality and uncertainty principle on the sphere, *submited*. ArXiv 1212.3887

[3] C. F. Dunkl, Differential-difference operators associated to reflection groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **311** (1989), 167 - 183.

[4] C. F. Dunkl and Y. Xu, *Orthogonal polynomials of several variables*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001.

[5] W. Erb, Uncertainty principles on compact Riemannian manifolds, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **29** (2010), 182-197.

[6] G. B. Folland and A. Sitaram, The uncertainty principle: a mathematical survey, *J. Fourier Anal. and Appl.*, **3** (1997), 207-238.

[7] F. J. Narcowich and J. D. Ward, Wavelets associated with periodic basis functions, *Appl. Comput. Harmonic Anal.* 3 (1996) 324-336.

[8] M. Rösler and M. Voit, An uncertainty principle for ultraspherical expansions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **209** (1997), 624-634.

[9] K. Selig, Uncertainty principles revisited, *Elect. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, **14** (2002), 165-177.

[10] S. Thanagavelu, *An introduction to the uncertainty principle*, Birkhuser, Boston, 2004.

[11] Y. Xu, Orthogonal polynomials on the ball and the simplex for weight functions with reflection symmetries, *Constr. Approx.* **17** (2001), 383 - 412.

[12] Y. Xu, Weighted approximation of functions on the unit sphere, *Constr. Approx.* **21** (2005), 1 - 28.

Department of Mathematics, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403-1222.
E-mail address: `yuan@math.uoregon.edu`